

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The Examiner acknowledged Applicants' claim to priority but indicated that one of the priority documents had not been received. The undersigned file shows that both certified priority applications were submitted with the original application papers. The Examiner is respectfully requested to review the file once again and determine whether or not the second priority application was in fact received.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Yeh although the text of the rejection appears to indicate that claims 14-20 were actually being rejected over a combination of Yeh and Yamamoto.

The Yeh patent teaches a fired mixture of ceramic powder and glass powder. While the Office Action avers that the ceramic powder is selected from the group consisting of $MgAl_2O_4$, $Mg_3B_2O_6$ and $Mg_2B_2O_5$ in the reference, a careful review has not revealed any such disclosure. The Office Action refers to col. 5, lines 20-25, but no such ceramics are disclosed at that passage. There is accordingly, no factual basis for rejecting the claims based on Yeh, alone or in combination with another reference.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of this application is respectfully submitted.

Dated: May 20, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorneys for Applicant